Case 1:20-cv-01624-DAD-SKO Docume	nt 20 Filed 11/22/21 Page 1 of 2
	SC DISTRICT COLIDT
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10	
TOGUNA DANIG DI AND	No. 1:20-cv-01624-NONE-SKO (PC)
	NO. 1.20-CV-01024-NOINE-SKO (FC)
,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
	ACTION
,	(Doc. No. 17)
Defendant.	
16 Philific III Philippin III III III III III III III III III I	
Plaintiff Joshua Davis Bland is a state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> and <i>in forma pauperis</i> in	
this civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United	
States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
On September 2, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge found that the court lacks subject-	
21 matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims, and that plaintiff's claim for emotional injuries is	
barred by the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA). (Doc. No. 12.) Therefore, the magistrate	
judge ordered plaintiff to show cause why this action should not be dismissed. (<i>Id.</i> at 3.) Plaintiff	
filed a response to the order to show cause on October 15, 2021. (Doc. No. 15.)	
On October 18, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and	
recommendations, recommending that this action be dismissed. (Doc. No. 17.) Therein, the	
magistrate judge found that plaintiff's response to the order to show cause does not meaningfully	
call into question the court's lack of jurisdiction	on over plaintiff's claims or that his claim for
	JOSHUA DAVIS BLAND, Plaintiff, V. KEN CLARK, Defendant. Plaintiff Joshua Davis Bland is a state this civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. On September 2, 2021, the assigned matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims, and barred by the Prison Litigation Reform Act (P. judge ordered plaintiff to show cause why this filed a response to the order to show cause on On October 18, 2021, the assigned mag recommendations, recommending that this act

emotions injuries is barred by the PLRA. (*Id.* at 2.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and provided him 14 days to file objections thereto. (Id. at 4.) Plaintiff has not filed any objections, and the time to do so has passed. Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations issued on October 18, 2021 (Doc. No. 17) are adopted in full; 2. This action is dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and because plaintiff's claim for emotional injuries is barred by the PLRA; and, 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case for purposes of closure and to close this case. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **November 21, 2021**

Case 1:20-cv-01624-DAD-SKO Document 20 Filed 11/22/21 Page 2 of 2